

necessary. Item No. 8 of the proposed measure to which some members were opposed was thus a very desirable provision and he would therefore lend his unqualified support to it.

Even with regard to the other provisions of the measure, he was inclined to support them generally but there were certain points which he thought should have been made more clear. For example, it was not clear what exactly were the appropriate safeguards referred to in item No. 1 of the main changes. It was necessary that Government should make all these points clear in the Bill itself. In fact, he said, the House would have appreciated very much if the Government had placed the entire Bill in the hands of the members.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL in finally replying to the debate observed that Messrs. Hosakoppa Krishna Rao and Bhashyam Aiyangar had clearly referred to the more important advantages that would result from the proposed legislation, and so, not much was left for him to add. The basic principle of the proposed legislation being to help the indebted agriculturists as against creditors, it was needless to emphasise that small inconveniences that might possibly be caused to others by the proposed legislation should naturally assume minor importance.

Objection was taken by some of the previous speakers to the proposal empowering the land mortgage bank to distrain crops. His only answer to them was that the exercise of such a power by the bank would be a blessing to the debtor for, if that power was not given the only way open to the bank to recover the outstandings would be to recall the entire loan. This would certainly work as a great hardship on the debtors. But, on the other hand, by distraining the produce the bank would not be interfering with the privilege of the debtor of enjoying the ownership of the land.

Objection had also been taken by some members to the proposal to empower the bank to demand further security. This power was proposed to be given merely to enable the bank to secure the interests of the debenture-holders.

Otherwise, whenever the bank felt that the security once offered was deteriorating, it would be the duty of the bank immediately to recall the entire loan, and if its repayment was insisted upon, the debtor would surely be ruined. Thus, this provision really meant to help the raiyat.

With regard to the desirability or otherwise of throwing the burden of proof on the minor members of a joint Hindu family, instead of on the creditors, Government shared the opinions expressed by Mr. Bhashyam Aiyangar.

Continuing, the FIRST MEMBER explained that Government sympathised with some of the other suggestions made by certain speakers, namely: (1) grant of concessions to other co-operative societies rendering aid to agriculturists, (2) the lowering of the minimum amount of loans to agriculturists, and (3) reduction of rates of interest, etc.; and Government would certainly consider them all in course of time.

On the whole, he was glad to find that the House was in favour of the measure.

The general principles of the Bill were thereupon put to vote and passed.

The House then adjourned to meet again at 12 of the clock the next day.

FOURTH DAY.

Tuesday, 23rd October 1934.

The House reassembled at 12 of the clock.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.—*contd.*

Revenue Demand, Collection and Balance of Maddhikayachamanahalli (Krishnarajapet Taluk).

MR. S. K. SIDDH GOWDA (Krishnarajpet Taluk).—

Q.—10. Will the Government be pleased to state.—

(a) What was the *Jamabandi* of Maddhikayachamanahalli (Krishnarajpet Taluk) in the years 1932-33 and 1933-34?

(b) What was the collection during each of those years?

(c) What was the balance at the end of each year?

(d) What was the amount collected in excess?

(e) What are the items in those years in which excess was collected and how much under each head?

GENERAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT.—

A.—10.—

		Rs.	a.	p.
(a) 1932-33	...	8,269	1	2
1933-34	...	8,519	15	9
(b) 1932-33	...	4,250	3	9
1933-34	...	3,115	12	2
(c) 1932-33	...	4,018	13	5
1933-34	...	5,404	3	7
(d) 1932-33	...	Nil.		
1933-34	...	Nil.		

(e) Does not arise in view of the answer given in (d).

MR. S. K. SIDDE GOWDA.—With reference to answer to (d), can the Government say for certain that no excess collection has been made?

GENERAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT.—Yes.

MR. S. K. SIDDE GOWDA.—Is it not a fact that the shanbhogue mis-appropriated collections and absconded about three years ago?

GENERAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT.—Government have no information.

MR. S. K. SIDDE GOWDA.—Are the Government aware of the difficulties of the people as a result of the patel being in charge of the shanbhogue's duties also since then?

GENERAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT.—Government will make enquiries if complaints of irregularities come up in the matter.

MR. S. K. SIDDE GOWDA.—Are the Government aware that in the absence of information as to the collections made by the shanbhogue, the patel is insisting on repayment of the *kandayam* for previous years as if they had not been paid by the landholders?

GENERAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT.—We have no information.

MR. S. K. SIDDE GOWDA.—Does the patel know what amounts exactly are really due from the raiyats?

GENERAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT.—The patel is also expected to know it. However, the matter will be looked into.

MR. MUMMADI H. C. VEERABHADRAPPA.—If cases of excess collections are brought to notice, will the Government be pleased to order a refund of the amounts?

GENERAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT.—If such cases come to notice, Government will see what action is necessary.

MR. M. SUBBAIYA.—Is it not a fact that the shanbhogue has run away and cases have been instituted against him?

GENERAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT.—Notice.

MR. M. SUBBAIYA.—Has it come to the notice of Government that even when parties produced receipts granted by the shanbhogue for payments made in the past, the Amildar refused to accept them but insisted on fresh payments?

GENERAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT.—No.

MR. M. SUBBAIYA.—Will the Government issue instructions to the Amildar that in such cases payment once again should not be insisted upon?

GENERAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT.—That question will arise only after cases of the kind mentioned come to notice.

MR. K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA.—When the raiyats produce receipts, why should the Amildar insist on repayment of the same year's demand?

GENERAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT.—The parties would do well to appeal to the Deputy Commissioner in the first instance in such cases.

MR. V. V. IYER.—Why is it that the collection in both the years is shown to be only 50 per cent of the demand? Do Government believe that the khatedars are really in arrears in respect of all the balance?

GENERAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT.—It is quite possible.